



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,789	10/12/2001	Radhika R. Roy	2685/5895	7757
23838	7590	06/15/2005	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON 1 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,789

Applicant(s)

ROY, RADHIKA R.

Examiner

Andrew C. Lee

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/04/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5999525) in view of Hauser et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6426957 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 13, 18, 29, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of a method, machine-readable medium, server system of providing common value-added services for two-way real-time communications using various communication protocols (Fig.15, Fig.16, Fig. 17, Fig.18, Figs.19B - 19F; column 2, lines 23 – 43; column 20, lines 8 – 25), the method comprising: receiving a request from a first of a plurality of communication protocol sources for a first value-added service using a first common value-added service protocol (Fig.10A, column 99, E., Re-usable Call Flow Blocks; First paragraph, lines 48 – 52); providing the requested first value-added service to the first communication protocol source using said first common value-added service protocol (Fig.10A, column 99, E., Re-usable Call Flow Blocks; First paragraph, lines 52 – 66); receiving a request from a second of said plurality of communication protocol sources for the first value-added service using said first common value-added service protocol

Art Unit: 2664

(column 101, lines 46 – 50); and providing the requested first value-added service to the second communication protocol source using said first common value-added service protocol (column 101, lines 50 – 64). Krishnaswamy et al. does not disclose expressly point-to-point, multi-point-to-multi-point, point-to-multi-point, and/or multi-point-to-point communications. Hauser et al. discloses the limitation of point-to-point, multi-point-to-multi-point, point-to-multi-point, and/or multi-point-to-point communications (column 3, lines 35 – 41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Krishnaswamy et al. to include a point-to-point, multi-point-to-multi-point, point-to-multi-point, and/or multi-point-to-point communications such as that taught by Hauser et al. in order to provide switch flow control within a telecommunication switch and provide advantage of ability to transfer cells with guarantees against cell loss.

Regarding claim 2, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method, machine-readable medium, server system as defined in claimed wherein the requests received from the first and second communication protocol sources being identical in format at an application layer level, and the first and second communication protocol sources being different in format at a transport layer level (column 125, lines 9, 14 – 29; column 128, lines 21 – 22; lines 25 – 34).

Regarding claims 3, 19, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method, machine-readable medium, server system as defined in claimed further comprising: receiving a request from the first communication protocol source for a second value-added service using a second common value-added service protocol; and

Art Unit: 2664

providing the requested second value-added service to the first communication protocol source using said second common value-added service protocol (column 125, lines 9, 14 – 29; column 128, lines 21 – 22; lines 25 – 34).

Regarding claims 4, 20, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method, machine-readable medium, server system as defined in claimed further comprising: receiving a request from the second communication protocol source for the second value-added service using said second common value-added service protocol; and providing the requested second value-added service to the second communication protocol source using said second common value-added service protocol (column 128, lines 21 – 22; lines 25 – 34).

Regarding claims 5, 7, 14, 21, 23, 30, 32, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method, machine-readable medium, server system as defined in claimed wherein both of said first communication protocol source and said second communication protocol source operate using the same one of an H.323 protocol, an H.310 protocol and an H.324 protocol (column 131, lines 45 – 47).

Regarding claims 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 24, 25, 31, 33, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method as defined in claimed wherein said first communication protocol source is one of a user terminal, a media gateway controller (MGC), a gatekeeper (GK), a multi-point control unit (MCU), and a gateway (GW) (Fig. 19C, column 131, lines 56 – 65; column 132, line 1, lines 30 – 38).

Regarding claims 10, 11, 12, 17, 26, 27, 28, 34, Krishnaswamy et al. discloses the limitation of the method as defined in claimed wherein said first common value-added service protocol is one of a policy service protocol, a directory service protocol, a security service protocol, a billing/accounting service protocol, and a visitor/home location service protocol (column 9, lines 20; column 23, lines 14 – 18, lines 25 – 32; column 58, lines 63 – 67).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Application/Control Number: 09/974,789

Page 6

Art Unit: 2664

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ACL

June 03, 2005


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner